

MAY 18 2007

SN 10/624,350
Docket No. 99,952**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-19 are pending in the application. Claims 14-19 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over four separate combinations of prior art. Applicants amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the metallic tape is a polycrystalline metal including nickel. Applicants cancelled claims 7 and 8. Since November 21, 2006, Applicants interviewed the Examiner in-person on April 12, 2007 and by phone on May 18, 2007.

1. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Qiao in view of Datta

Claims 1, 3-5, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Qiao (provisional application 60/483,956) in view of Datta (US 6,228,246B1) and Rosswag (US 4,372,831). A § 103(a) rejection is proper if the prior art references suggest to the skilled artisan that they can be combined and that this combination would have a reasonable probability of success. Because Applicants previously removed Qiao as a prior art reference by submitting 37 CFR 1.131 and 37 CFR 1.132 declarations, Applicants traverse the rejection.

On April 10, 2003 Applicants published "Continuous electropolishing of Halstelloy substrates for ion-beam assisted deposition of MgO" ("Publication") in Superconductor Science and Technology. Based on the Publication, Applicants submitted a 37 CFR 1.131 declaration establishing a date of conception prior to Qiao. Applicants concurrently submitted a 37 CFR 1.132 declaration stating that "the scope of the Publication . . . would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art to be commensurate with the scope of the claims of the Application." 37 CFR 1.132 declaration, paragraph 4.

Despite this showing, the Examiner continues to argue (1) "the evidence provided is not commensurate with the scope of the invention" and (2) "the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention." Office Action 11/21/2006, at 13 and 15. Specifically the Examiner argues (i) "the declaration does not provide evidence of conception for electropolishing metallic tape having an 'initial roughness of more than 10 nm,'" (ii) "the declaration does not provide evidence of conception for applying current densities of 'at least 0.18 A/cm²' and 'at least 0.37 A/cm²,'" and (iii) "the

SN 10/624,350
Docket No. 99,952

declaration does not provide evidence of conception for an anode that includes a metal selected from the group consisting of titanium, niobium, tantalum, platinum, rhenium, rhodium, nickel, chromium, gold and silver." Id. at 17-20. In sum, the Examiner argues the Publication must have an identical disclosure with the subject matter claimed.

MPEP 715.02 only requires that "the differences between the claimed invention and the showing under 37 CFR 1.131 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the applicant's 37 CFR 1.131 evidence, prior to the effective date of the reference or the activity." The Applicants' 37 CFR 1.131 and 37 CFR 1.132 evidence satisfies this burden because, as stated above, the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration provides that "the scope of the Publication . . . would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art to be commensurate with the scope of the claims of the Application." 37 CFR 1.132 declaration, paragraphs 4-6. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Qiao in view of Datta and Rosswag further in view of Drummond (US 2,330,562). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Qiao in view of Datta and Rosswag further in view of Drummond and further in view of Tezuka (US 5,843,290). Because Qiao has been removed as prior art for claim 1, it is similarly removed as prior art for claims 9-12. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

2. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Arendt '150

Although the Examiner indicated during the May 18, 2007 phone interview that this rejection had been overcome, Applicants have not received official notice of such action. Therefore, claims 1, 3-5, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Arendt (US 2003/0144150A1). Arendt '150 has a common inventor with the instant application, and therefore Arendt '150 constitutes prior art only under 35 USC § 102(e). Because Applicants can disqualify Arendt '150 under 35 USC § 103(c), Applicants traverse the rejection.

SN 10/624,350

Docket No. 99,952

Section 102(e) prior art can be disqualified if "the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." 35 USC § 103(c). All named inventors for Arendt '150 and the instant application were employees of the University of California ("UC") at the time the claimed invention was made and therefore subject to an obligation of assignment to UC. In support of this argument, Applicant submit herewith a copy of the assignment documentation for Arendt '150. Because Arendt '150 is disqualified under § 103(c), the § 103(a) rejection is improper. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

3. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Arendt '483 in view of Rosswag

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Arendt (US 2003/0036483A1) in view of Rosswag (US 4,372,831). A § 103(a) rejection is proper if the prior art references suggest to the skilled artisan that they can be combined and that this combination would have a reasonable probability of success. Because Arendt '483 in view of Rosswag does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, Applicants traverse the rejection.

As suggested by the Examiner during the April 12, 2007 in-person interview, Applicants submit herewith a 37 CFR 1.132 declaration establishing that:

- a. Arendt 483 teaches an article comprising a substrate, a layer of an inert oxide material upon the surface of the substrate, a layer of an amorphous oxide or oxynitride material upon the inert oxide material layer, and a layer of an oriented cubic oxide material having a rock-salt-like structure upon the amorphous oxide or oxynitride material layer;
- b. Arendt '483 paragraphs [0015] and [0016] teach that a metallic substrate often has a RMS roughness of 15 nm to 100 nm or greater;
- c. Arendt '483 paragraphs [0015] and [0016] teach that the metallic substrate can be mechanically polished, electrochemically polished, or chemically polished to reduce the RMS roughness, but, even if polished, the inert oxide layer must be deposited to give the substrate a RMS roughness of less than 2 nm;

SN 10/624,350

Docket No. 99,952

- d. one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to attain a RMS roughness of less than about 2 nm by any electropolishing process disclosed in Arendt '483 without the inert oxide layer;
- e. at the time of Arendt '483 a process for electropolishing a metallic substrate to a RMS roughness of less than 2 nm was not known; and
- f. Rosswag does not satisfy the deficiencies of Arendt '483.

Because the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration establishes that Arendt '483 in view of Rosswag does not teach or suggest a process for electropolishing a metallic tape to the claimed RMS roughness of 4 nm, the § 103(a) rejection is improper. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

4. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Glowacki in view of Rosswag

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Glowacki (*Texture developments in long lengths of NiFe tapes for superconducting coated conductors*, J. of Materials Science, vol. 37, no 1, pp 157-168, Jan. 2002) in view of Rosswag (US 4,372,831). A § 103(a) rejection is proper if the prior art references suggest to the skilled artisan that they can be combined and that this combination would have a reasonable probability of success. Because Glowacki in view of Rosswag does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, Applicants traverse the rejection.

As suggested by the Examiner during the April 12, 2007 in-person interview, Applicants submit herewith a 37 CFR 1.132 declaration establishing that:

- a. "mirror gloss" is a subjective term and that a surface does not need to be smooth to the claimed RMS roughness of about 4 nm to be sufficiently specular to be a mirror finish;
- b. "mirror gloss" can be discerned from a surface with a RMS roughness as high as 20 nm;
- c. contrary to the Examiner's statements, combining Glowacki's disclosure and Rosswag's statement that "a mirror gloss or shine is obtained in the upper current density range" would not suggest to one skilled in the art that the claimed RMS roughness in claim 1 of about 4 nm could be achieved;

SN 10/624,350

Docket No. 99,952

- d. furthermore, combining Glowacki's disclosure and Rosswag's statement that "a mirror gloss or shine is obtained in the upper current density range" would not suggest to one skilled in the art that the claimed RMS roughness in claim 3 of about 0.5 nm could be achieved;
- e. Paul Arendt, an Applicant, is a coauthor of *Improvements of IBAD MgO Template Layers on Metallic Substrates for YBCO HTS Deposition* (IEEE Transactions of Applied Superconductivity, vol. 13, no. 2, June 2003; submitted herewith) ("Article");
- f. the Article discusses the relationship of critical current density and substrate RMS roughness;
- g. as shown in Figure 3 of the Article, a dramatic increase in critical current density is observed with decreased substrate RMS roughness;
- h. in particular Figure 3 of the Article shows that a critical current density of less than 0.2 MA/cm² corresponds to a substrate RMS roughness of about 4 nm whereas a critical current density greater than 1.0 MA/cm² corresponds to a substrate RMS roughness of about 0.5 nm which indicates that a smoother substrate yields a significantly higher critical current density; and
- i. even though the Article involves a substrate with a coating layer, the same relationship between critical current density and substrate RMS roughness is observed for a 4 nm electropolished metallic tape and a 0.5 nm electropolished metallic tape.

Because the included 37 CFR 1.132 declaration establishes that Glowacki in view of Rosswag does not teach or suggest a process for electropolishing a metallic tape to a RMS roughness of less than about 4 nm, the § 103(a) rejection is improper. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Glowacki in view of Rosswag further in view of Drummond (US 2,330,562). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Glowacki in view of Rosswag further in view of Drummond and further in view of Tezuka (US 5,843,290). Because the prior art fails to render claim 1 obvious, it

SN 10/624,350
Docket No. 99,952
similarly fails to render claims 9-12 obvious. Thus, Applicants kindly request the rejection be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2007

Reg. No. 59,740
Phone (505) 665-0200

Holly L. Teeter

Signature of Attorney

Holly L. Teeter
Los Alamos National Laboratory
LC/IP MS A187
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

S-100,569

AND the ASSIGNOR(S) requests the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to issue said Letters Patent of the United States and any reissue or extension thereof to the ASSIGNEE, The Regents of the University of California.

executed this

5th day of Feb., 2003

Signature of Inventor(s)

Paul N. Arendt
Paul N. Arendt

7th day of February, 2003

Stephen R. Foltyn
Stephen R. Foltyn

7th day of Feb., 2003

James R. Groves
James R. Groves

7th day of Feb., 2003

Quanxi Jia
Quanxi Jia